ment, a particular target of the new regime. And he is well aware of the danger he faces, should the soldiers come after him. On the day the coup took place, he told me, he and one of his sons saw ten high-school students marched from their school, their hands over their heads, after a brief skirmish with carabineros. They were forced to lie face down on the ground, and then a policeman walked the line of prone youngsters, spraying them with machinegun fire.

The stories of atrocities are endless, and by now, inhabitants of the poblaciones are utterly terrified. "I am too afraid to look for him," says a woman from the Ultima Hora población, whose husband was last seen covered with blood being hauled away in a police truck. "I am afraid that they will take me, too, and what would happen then to my four children?" Many are now afraid even to associate with families that had any connection with Allende's regime—whether as party members, union leaders or employees in the food-distribution centers. "They can kill whomever they want to kill," says Contreras bitterly. "There is nothing, absolutely nothing, that we can do about it."

Because of the total censorship of domestic reporting, most middle- and upper-class Chileans have no idea what is happening. They hear rumors, but their hatred for Allende compounded by their historic contempt for the *rotos* leaves them little desire to verify them. Many do not believe the stories about slaughter in the poblaciones; many simply don't much care. "Why should we?" a Chilean lawyer asked me over an expensive lunch in a wealthy section of Santiago. "I don't believe the stories you tell me, but after the things the supporters of Salvador Allende have done to Chile, they deserve whatever happens to them."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 2, 1973]

THOSE HORROR TALES FROM CHILE * * *

(By Pablo Huneeus)

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—The military coup turned Allende's comedy into Chile's tragedy. But the Newsweek article "Slaughterhouse in Santiago," Oct. 8, turned our tragedy into a horror tale. It caused such a misunderstanding as to the true nature of what happened down here that I decided to retrace the steps of Newsweek's correspondent John Barnes to double check the information that he said came from the Santiago morgue.

Known here as the Medical Legal Institute it is a small, neat grey building near the General Cemetery. It looks like a hospital except that all the people lying on the stretchers are dead. An autopsy is the only operation performed by its doctors.

Over two days I interviewed a random sample of seven doctors, five clerks, three typists and four porters. To each I showed or translated the Newsweek article and questioned them about their reactions. Here's a summary of what they said:

1. Without a single exception all uttered comments like "lies," "what an exaggeration," "brilliant imagination," or "absolutely false." Dr. Vargas, an elderly experienced pathologist, dismissed the whole story on the grounds that the Newsweek correspondent suffered what is called "perception shock." When exposed to a couple of bodies, he explained, the shock alters perception capabilities. "When there are 10 bodies together many persons can't even recognize their wives or fathers. That must have happened to that correspondent," he said, presuming he ever got in the morgue."

2. Also without exception, the staff doubted that he was ever inside the morgue because his descriptions didn't fit. For example, Newsweek describes a corridor with 50 bodies in it, but there isn't any corridor large enough to hold that many bodies. The only corridor in which there are bodies to be seen under normal conditions is outside the autopsy rooms and it can handle only a few in line. Mr. Barnes also claims to have seen bodies upstairs, but the staff says none have ever been taken up there. Upstairs there are only offices and laboratories. The autopsy rooms are on the ground floor and the refrigeration storage rooms in the basement.

3. A picture of a man with a missing leg published by Newsweek with the caption, "A dead amputee in Santiago: The reign of terror was worse than anyone imagined," is actually a man who died some time earlier in a traffic accident. He was run down by a Chevrolet pick-up truck.

4. By far the worst misrepresentation in the Newsweek article was the report during the two week period after the coup 2,796 bodies had come to the morgue. Newsweek says ". . . though information is almost nonexistent for the rest of Chile, the presumption is that the executions have followed a similar pattern in other cities."

Every dead body that arrives receives a number that goes up on a list posted outside with the name. Number one begins on January first. The Newsweek figure is for all the bodies received at the morgue from the beginning of the year to Sept. 21. It's this figure that is being quoted all around the world as the casualty rate in Santiago alone for the first 14 days of the coup.

(Kenneth Auchincloss, executive editor of Newsweek, says he has "complete confidence" in Mr. Barnes, "he's covered wars before." Mr. Auchincloss says Mr. Barnes was given the 2,796 dated figure by a daughter of a member of the morgue staff, adding, "I think it is conceivable that there was a misunderstanding. But that is pure speculation on my part. I haven't checked it out with Mr. Barnes. There is no reason to doubt his reporting.")

This is enough to demonstrate the falsehoods in the Newsweek story. To me it's a case of journalistic imperialism. A rich American magazine sends from London a British correspondent a week after the coup. He makes no effort to understand what is really going on here. He only wants to use us for a story that will sell. He knows the market wants a horror story. He flavors his story with an underlying contempt for Chile and its people, tops it with a total lack of respect for the truth and cooks it with imaginative fiction writing. It brings glory to him and disgrace to us.

Not that I am happy with the junta. Every Chilean feels that no matter how low the death toll, what happened is a tragedy. We are accustomed to see our presidents end their constitutional term and walk quietly home. But the military intervention is the logical outcome of a Marxist regime. I am no wizard, but in a book I wrote a year ago I said that Chile was heading towards a military regime. There was such hatred among Chileans that the only way of holding us together was through force.

This hatred springs from a long history of frustration with politicians. By 1970 we had already tried most political formulas: a populist government with Ibanez, a conservative right wing one with Alessandri and a liberal Christian Democrat one with Frei. All failed to give us the results we wanted and so we tried Marxism.

It was the great experiment. But the guinea pigs rebelled.

But intellectuals throughout the world doted on the Allende regime. Soon it was evident that under the cover of clever public relations, a machine aimed at taking over total power was being built. In the first months of his term, Allende admitted to Debray that his respect for the constitution and democratic institutions was only a tactic to gain power.

The country unanimously agreed on nationalizing copper and monopolistic corporations. But soon para-military brigades began roaming the countryside and seizing farms by force and expelling farmers at gun point. Industries, even very small ones, were seized; workers who opposed were suppressed or beaten; an opposition leader was assassinated; technicians were fired for political reasons. Because of the imported doctrine of class warfare, the official gospel was hate. Dr. Allende started it when he declared at the beginning of his term that he was *not* the president of all Chileans.

Our technicians left the country and we began to import slogans from China, educational programs from East Germany, high-government officials from Cuba and terrorists from all over Latin America. Our president imported guns labeled art objects. He had a guerrilla training camp in his house and there were finally enough arms in the country to supply 20,000 irregulars.

Allende lost all legitimacy. It was worse than Watergate. We were sinking and the man at the helm was unable to govern. Even Marxists agreed that we were sinking, the only debate was over whose fault it was.

I would have preferred a democratic solution, a plebiscite or a new election for congress and the presidency as the opposition leaders proposed. But Allende refused to compromise and he refused to follow the majority's will. He was determined to persuade us with guns.

That's why this deadly war machine was unleashed. It's sad so many died, but it's good so many survived.

SLAUGHTER IN SANTIAGO

"Last week I slipped through a side door into the Santiago city morgue. . . . One hundred and fifty dead bodies were laid out on the ground floor. . . . Upstairs I passed through a swing door and there in a dimly lit corridor lay at least 50 more bodies. . . . Most had been shot at close range under the chin. Some had been machinegunned. . . . Their chests had been slit open and sewn together grotesquely. . . . They were all young and, judging from the roughness of their hands, all from the working class. . . . Most of their heads had been crushed. I remained for perhaps two minutes at most, then left the building. . . . Workers at the morgue have been warned that they will be court martialed and shot if they reveal what is going on there. . . . But the morgue count alone sets the regime's kill rate at an appalling 200 Chileans a day—just for the capital."—Correspondent John Barnes in Newsweek, Oct. 8.

Correspondent Barnes' vivid account of the Chilean coup has turned into one of the most effective bits of journalism in years. Senator Kennedy placed it in the Congressional Record. It is being used in advertisements by organizations opposed to the present Chilean regime. Its staggering casualty figures have been accepted as gospel in many European countries. It may have been instrumental in causing the U.S. to delay aid to Chile "until Human Rights are restored." But was it true?

Dissenting is Pablo Huneeus, a Chilean journalist and professor of sociology at the University of Chile, who previously has assisted American correspondents, including those of The Wall Street Journal and Newsweek, in preparation of reports on Chile.

. . . AND A FEW LOUD ECHOES FROM ACADEMIA

(By Everett G. Martin)

So many misleading reports and analyses of the events surrounding the military coup in Chile have appeared in reputable publications, in special programs on public television and on radio that it's probably impossible now to set the record straight on even a few points.

It's not just opinions that differ. Interpretations, mostly by members of the academic community and by journalists who look more to what excites their editors than at what Chile is about, have distorted the events out of all sense of reality.

Thus Chile, which is one of the most complex nations in the world, has been turned into a simple black and white situation of good guys (the Marxist followers of the late